arXiv:math/0509065v1 [math.RA] 3 Sep 2005

Simple decompositions of simple Lie superalgebras

T.V.Tvalavadze [1]

Department of Mathematics and Statistics

Memorial University of Newfoundland

St. John's, NL, CANADA.

[1] *supported by NSERC Grant 227060-00*

Chapter 1

Introduction

In this paper we consider Lie superalgebras decomposable as the sum of two proper subalgebras. Any of these algebras has the form of the vector space sum $L = A + B$ where A and B are proper simple subalgebras which need not be ideals of L, and the sum need not be direct.

The main result of this paper is the following

Theorem 1.0.1 *Let $S = osp(m, 2n)$ be a Lie superalgebra such that $S = K + L$ where K, L are two proper basic simple subalgebras. Then m is even, $m = 2k$ and $K \cong osp(2k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong sl(k, n)$.*

In this paper all suablebras are Z_2-graded.

1.1 Decompositions of $osp(m, 2n)$ as the sum of basic Lie subalgebras

1.1.1 Preliminaries

We use the following technical Lemmas:

Lemma 1.1.1 *Let $L \cong sl(m, n)$, $L = L_0 \oplus L_1$ where L_0 is an even part of L, L_1 is an odd part of L. Then the following properties hold:*

(a) $L_0 = I_1 \oplus I_2 \oplus U$, *where* $I_1 \cong sl(m)$, $I_2 \cong sl(n)$ *and* U *is either one dimensional Lie algebra if* $m = n$ *or zero element.*
(b) L_0*-module* L_1 *is a direct sum of two irreducible* L_0*-modules of the dimension* mn *with highest weights* (λ, μ) *and* (μ, λ), *where* $\lambda = (1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ *and* $\mu = (0, \ldots, 0, 1)$.
(c) $[L_1, L_1] = L_0$
(d) $[I_1, L_1] = L_1$ *and* $[I_2, L_1] = L_1$
(e) I_1*-module* L_1 *is a direct sum of* $2n$ *irreducible* I_1*-modules of dimension* m *and* I_2*-module* L_1 *is a direct sum of* $2m$ *irreducible* I_2*-modules of dimension* n.

Lemma 1.1.2 *Let* $L \cong osp(m, 2n)$. *Then*
(a) $L_0 = I_1 \oplus I_2$, *where* $I_1 \cong o(m)$, $I_2 \cong sp(2n)$.
(b) L_0*-module* L_1 *is a irreducible* L_0*-modules of dimension* $2mn$.
(c) $[L_1, L_1] = L_0$
(d) $[I_1, L_1] = L_1$ *and* $[I_2, L_1] = L_1$
(e) I_1*-module* L_1 *is a direct sum of* $2n$ *irreducible* I_1*-modules of dimension* m *and* I_2*-module* L_1 *is a direct sum of* m *irreducible* I_2*-modules of dimension* $2n$.

The proof of these Lemmas can be found in [4].

The following two Lemmas give the decomposition of simple Lie algebra as the sum of simple subalgebras. They were found by Onishchik (see [5]). These matrix forms can be found in [1].

Lemma 1.1.3 *Let* $o(2n)$ *be decomposable into the sum of two subalgebras isomorphic to* $o(2n-1)$ *and* $sl(n)$. *Then there exists a basis of* F^{2n} *such that this decomposition takes the following matrix form:*

$$S = N + M, \tag{1}$$

where $S \cong o(2n)$ *consists of the matrices:*

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ \hline A_{21} & A_{22} \end{array}\right) \tag{2}$$

where A_{12}, A_{21} are skew-symmetric matrices of order n and A_{11}, A_{22} are matrices of order n such that $A_{22} = -A_{11}^t$.

The first subalgebra $N \cong o(2n-1)$ consists of the matrices:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|ccc|c|ccc} 0 & y_1 & \dots & y_{n-1} & 0 & x_1 & \dots & x_{n-1} \\ \hline x_1 & & & & -x_1 & & & \\ \vdots & & A'_{11} & & \vdots & & A'_{12} & \\ x_{n-1} & & & & -x_{n-1} & & & \\ \hline 0 & -y_1 & \dots & -y_{n-1} & 0 & -x_1 & \dots & -x_{n-1} \\ \hline y_1 & & & & -y_1 & & & \\ \vdots & & A'_{21} & & \vdots & & A'_{22} & \\ y_{n-1} & & & & -y_{n-1} & & & \end{array}\right) \tag{3}$$

where A'_{12}, A'_{21} are skew-symmetric matrices of order $n-1$ and A'_{11}, A'_{22} are matrices of order $n-1$ such that $A'_{22} = -A'^t_{11}$.

The second subalgebra $M \cong sl(n)$ consists of the matrices:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} A_1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & A_2 \end{array}\right)$$

where A_1, A_2 are matrices of order n with zero trace such that $A_2 = -A_1^t$.

Lemma 1.1.4 *Let $o(4n)$ be decomposable into the sum of two subalgebras isomorphic to $o(4n-1)$ and $sp(2n)$. Then there exists a basis of F^{4n} such that this decomposition takes the following matrix form:*

$$S = N + M \tag{4}$$

where $S \cong o(4n)$ consists of the matrices of the form (2) where $A_{11}, A_{12}, A_{21}, A_{22}$ are of the order $2n$.

The first subalgebra $N \cong o(4n-1)$ has the form (3), where A_1, B_1, C_1, D_1 are of the order $2n-1$.

The second subalgebra $M \cong sp(2n)$ consists of the matrices:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} Y & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -Y^t \end{array}\right)$$

where Y is the set of matrices

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array}\right)$$

where B, C are skew-symmetric matrices of order n and $D = -A^t$.

1.1.2 Description of L_0-modules and K_0-modules

Let $S = osp(m, 2n)$ be a Lie superalgebra such that $S = K + L$ where K, L are two proper basic simple subalgebras. We consider $S \cong osp(m, 2n)$ as the subalgebra of $gl(m, 2n)$. Then $L \subset S$ is also a subalgebra of $gl(m, 2n)$ and $L_0 \subset gl(m) \oplus gl(2n)$. Hence we have two natural representations ρ_1 and ρ_2 of L_0 in vector spaces V and W where V is a column vector space of dimension m, and W is a column vector space of dimension $2n$. We will also consider V and W as L_0-module such that

$$xv = \rho_1(x)(v)$$

and

$$xw = \rho_2(x)(w),$$

for any $x \in L_0$, $v \in V$, $w \in W$.

L_0-modules V and W are completely reducible because L_0 is a reductive Lie algebra. Let $V = V_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus V_r$ and $W = W_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus W_d$, where V_i,W_j are simple L_0-modules.

Next we consider L_0-module $V = V_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus V_r$. Let I_1 and I_2 be ideals of L_0. Next we define the following types of L_0-module V_i.

1. L_0-module V_i is of *type 1* if L_0-module V_i is trivial.

2. L_0-module V_i is of *type 2* if I_2 acts trivially on V_i but $I_1(V_i) \neq \{0\}$. In this case, we consider V_i as I_1-module.

3. L_0-module V_i is of *type 3* if I_1 acts trivially on V_i but $I_2(V_i) \neq \{0\}$. In this case, we consider V_i as I_2-module.

4. L_0-module V_i is of *type 4* if $I_1(V_i) \neq \{0\}$ and $I_2(V_i) \neq \{0\}$

Similarly L_0-module W_j can also be one of the following types:

1. L_0-module W_j is of *type 1* if L_0-module W_j is trivial.

2. L_0-module W_j is of *type 2* if I_2 acts trivially on W_j but $I_1(W_j) \neq \{0\}$.

3. L_0-module W_j is of *type 3* if I_1 acts trivially on W_j but $I_2(W_j) \neq \{0\}$.

4. L_0-module W_j is of *type 4* if $I_1(W_j) \neq \{0\}$ and $I_2(W_j) \neq \{0\}$

In a similar manner we define types of K_0-modules.

Now we look at the decomposition $S = K + L$. We consider $S \cong osp(m,2n)$ as a subalgebra of $gl(m,2n)$. Hence $S_0 = K_0 + L_0 \subset gl(m,2n)_0$ and $S_1 = K_1 + L_1 \subset gl(m,2n)_1$. There exists an isomorphism between vector spaces $gl(m,2n)_1$ and $(V \otimes W^*) \oplus (V^* \otimes W)$. We identify $gl(m,2n)_1$ with $(V \otimes W^*) \oplus (V^* \otimes W)$. Hence L_0-module $gl(m,2n)_1$ can be viewed as a direct sum of two L_0-modules $V \otimes W^*$ and $V^* \otimes W$ such that

$$x(v \otimes f) = \rho_1(x)(v) \otimes f + v \oplus \rho_2^*(x)(f)$$

and

$$x(g \otimes w) = \rho_1^*(x)(g) \otimes w + g \oplus \rho_2(x)(w),$$

for any $x \in L_0$, $v \in V$, $w \in W$, $g \in V^*$, $f \in W^*$ and ρ_1^*, ρ_2^* are dual representations for ρ_1, ρ_2.

Since $V = V_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus V_r$ and $W = W_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus W_d$ where V_i,W_j are simple L_0-modules, we can express L_0-module $V^* \otimes W$ as a direct sum of L_0-modules $V_i^* \otimes W_j$,

$$V^* \otimes W = \bigoplus_{i,j} (V_i^* \otimes W_j).$$

We denote a projection of $V^* \otimes W$ onto $V_i^* \otimes W_j$ as π_{ij}. If $\dim W_{j_0} = \dim W_{j_1}$ then there exists an isomorphism $\lambda_{j_0 j_1} : W_{j_0} \mapsto W_{j_1}$. It extends to an isomorphism $\mu_{i j_0 j_1} : V_i^* \otimes W_{j_0} \mapsto V_i^* \otimes W_{j_1}$. In this paper instead of the expression $\pi_{i j_0}(x) = \lambda \mu_{i j_0 j_1}(\pi_{i j_1}(x))$ for any $x \in L_1$ we write $\pi_{i j_0}(L_1) = \lambda \pi_{i j_1}(L_1)$.

We choose a basis in $V \oplus W$ from elements of subspaces V_i, $i = 1 \dots r$ and W_j, $j = 1 \dots d$. Let us identify the elements form S and their matrix realizations in this basis. Let $\dim V_i = m_i$ and $\dim W_j = n_i$. Then we denote as ε'_i the natural isomorphism of V_i onto the column vector space F^{m_i} and ε''_i the natural isomorphism of W_i onto the column vector space F^{n_j}. We extend ε'_i and ε''_j to an isomorphism $\varepsilon_{ij} : V_i^* \otimes W_j \mapsto F^{m_i} \otimes F^{n_j}$. Let us define $\varrho_{ij} = \varepsilon_{ij}\pi_{ij} : V^* \otimes W \mapsto F^{m_i} \otimes F^{n_j}$

1.1.3 Properties of subalgebras $osp(p, 2q)$ and $sl(s, l)$ in the decomposition

Lemma 1.1.5 *Let $S = osp(m, 2n)$ be a Lie superalgebra, and S be decomposed into the sum of two proper simple subalgebras K and L of the type $osp(p, 2q)$ and $sl(s, l)$, respectively. Then m is even, $m = 2k$ for some k, $p = 2k-1$, $q = n$ and either $s = k$ or $l = k$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.2(a), $S_0 = o(m) \oplus sp(2n)$. We define two projections π_1 and π_2 of S_0 into the ideals $o(m)$ and $sp(2n)$, $\pi_1 : S_0 \to o(m)$ and $\pi_2 : S_0 \to sp(2n)$. Since K is isomorphic to $osp(p, 2q)$, K_0 is isomorphic to $o(p) \oplus sp(2q)$. By Lemma 2.1(a), L_0 is isomorphic to $sl(s) \oplus sl(l) \oplus U$. Since K_0 and L_0 are reductive subalgebras, the projections $\pi_1(K_0)$, $\pi_1(L_0)$, $\pi_2(K_0)$ and $\pi_2(L_0)$ are also reductive as homomorphic images of reductive algebras.

Since $S = K + L$, S_0 is decomposable into the sum of two subalgebras K_0 and L_0, $S_0 = K_0 + L_0$. Therefore, $\pi_1(S_0) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ and $\pi_2(S_0) = \pi_2(K_0) + \pi_2(L_0)$, where $\pi_1(\mathcal{S}_0) = o(m)$ and $\pi_2(\mathcal{S}_0) = sp(2n)$. We have the decompositions of simple Lie algebras $o(m)$ and $sp(2n)$ into the sum of two reductive subalgebras.

By Onishchik's Theorem (see [6]), $sp(2n)$ cannot be decomposed into the sum of two proper reductive subalgebras. Hence $sp(2n) = \pi_2(K_0) + \pi_2(L_0)$ is a trivial decomposition and $\pi_2(K_0) = sp(2n)$. Since $K_0 = o(p) \oplus sp(2q)$, it follows that $q = n$.

By Onishchik's Theorem, $o(m)$ has two decompositions into the sum of two proper reductive subalgebras:

1. If $m = 2k$ then $o(2k) = o(2k-1) + sl(k)$,
2. If $m = 4k$ then $o(4k) = o(4k-1) + sp(2k)$.

The decomposition $o(m) = \pi_1(K_0)+\pi_1(L_0)$ cannot be of the second type, because $\pi_1(L_0)$ is not isomorphic to $sp(2k)$. Moreover, this decomposition cannot be trivial, because $\pi_1(K_0) = o(m)$ and $\pi_2(K_0) = sp(2n)$. Hence K_0 coincides with S_0. This contradicts the fact that K is a proper subalgebra of S.

Therefore $o(m) = \pi_1(K_0)+\pi_1(L_0)$ is the decomposition of the first type and $m = 2k$, $\pi_1(K_0) \cong o(2k-1)$, $\pi_1(L_0) \cong sl(k)$. Since $K_0 \cong o(p) \oplus sp(2q)$ and $L_0 \cong sl(s) \oplus sl(l) \oplus U$, it follows that $p = 2k-1$, $q = n$ and either $s = k$ or $l = k$. □

Without any loss of generality, we assume that $L \cong sl(k,l)$.

Corollary 1.1.6 *L_0-module V is a direct sum of two L_0-modules of type 2, $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$. Moreover I_2 acts trivially on V, I_1-module V_1 is standard, and I_1-module V_2 is dual.*

Proof. From Lemma 2.5 in the decomposition $o(2k) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ the first component is isomorphic to $o(2k-1)$ and the second one is isomorphic to $sl(k)$. By Lemma 2.3, there exist bases of V such that the decomposition $o(2k) = o(2k-1)+sl(k)$ takes the matrix form (1). Hence $\pi_1(L_0)$ takes a form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} Y & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -Y^t \end{array} \right) \right\},$$

where Y is a set of matrices of order k with a zero trace. Therefore we obtain that $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ and I_2 acts trivially on V. Moreover, I_1-module V_1 is standard and I_1-module V_2 is dual.

□

1.1.4 Decompositions of $osp(2k, 2n)$ as the sum of $osp(2k-1, 2n)$ and $sl(k, l)$

Lemma 1.1.7 *Let $S = K + L$, where $S \cong osp(2k, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(2k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong sl(k, l)$.*

(a) There is no $j_0 \in \{1 \dots d\}$ such that for any $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\pi_{ij_0}(L_1) = 0$.

(b) There are no $j_0, j_1 \in \{1 \dots d\}$ such that for some $\lambda \in F$, $\varrho_{ij_0}(x) = \lambda \varrho_{ij_1}(x)$ where $x \in L_1$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Proof. By Corollary 2.6, $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ as simple L_0-modules. By Lemma 2.5, the decomposition $\pi_1(S_0) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ can be considered in the matrix form (1).

Let φ is a automorphism of $gl(2k)$, such that $\varphi(X) = QXQ^{-1}$, where

$$Q = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\begin{array}{c|c} I_k & I_k \\ \hline iI_k & -iI_k \end{array} \right)$$

where I_k is an unit matrix of order k.

We extend φ to an automorphism $\bar{\varphi}$ of $gl(2k, 2n)$ by the following formula:

$$\bar{\varphi}(Y) = \bar{Q} Y \bar{Q}^{-1} \tag{5}$$

where

$$Y = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array} \right),$$

$$\bar{Q} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} Q & 0 \\ \hline 0 & I_{2n} \end{array} \right)$$

Therefore we can obtain a new decomposition $\bar{\varphi}(S) = \bar{\varphi}(K) + \bar{\varphi}(L)$. Let $S' = \bar{\varphi}(S)$, $K' = \bar{\varphi}(K)$ and $L' = \bar{\varphi}(L)$.

First we consider K'. Since $K'_0 = \bar{\varphi}(K_0)$ and $\pi(K_0)$ have the form (3), the formula (5) gives us the following matrix form of K'_0:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & 0 \\ \hline 0 & D \end{array} \right) \right\} \tag{6}$$

where A is a set of skewsymmetric matrices with the first column and row zero.

Next we want to show that K_1' has the form

$$\left\{\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & B \\ \hline C & 0 \end{array}\right)\right\} \tag{7}$$

where the first column of C is zero.

Let $I_1 \cong o(2k-1)$, $I_2 \cong sp(2n)$ be ideals of K_0'. By Lemma 2.2(d), $K_1' = [I_1, K_1']$. Notice that I_1 has a form (6) where $D = 0$. Hence $[I_1, K_1']$ takes the form

$$\left\{\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & AB \\ \hline -CA & 0 \end{array}\right)\right\}.$$

Since the first column of A is zero, the first column of CA is zero. On the other hand $[I_1, K_1']$ coincides with K_1'. Hence we have proved that K_1' has a form (7) where the first column of C is zero.

Next we consider S'. Let π be a projection of $(V \otimes W^*) \oplus (V^* \otimes W)$ (or equivalently $gl(2k,2n)_1$) onto $V^* \otimes W$. Since S_1' is S_0'-module, $\pi(S_1')$ is also S_0'-module. We are going to prove that $\pi(S_1')$ coincides with $V^* \otimes W$.

First, S_0'-module $\pi(S_1')$ is not zero. Indeed, if $\pi(S_1') = \{0\}$ than S_1' has the following matrix form:

$$\left\{\left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & * \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array}\right)\right\}.$$

Hence $[S_1', S_1'] = \{0\}$. This contradicts the fact that, by Lemma 2.2(c), $[S_1', S_1'] = S_0' \neq \{0\}$.

By Lemma 2.2(b), S_0'-module S_1' is irreducible. Therefore S_0'-module S_1' is isomorphic to S_0'-module $\pi(S_1') \subseteq V^* \otimes W$. Since dimension of S_1' is $4kn$, it follows that dimension of $\pi(S_1')$ is also $4kn$. On the other hand, $\dim(V^* \otimes W) = (\dim V)(\dim W) = 4kn$. Hence $\pi(S_1')$ coincides with $V^* \otimes W$. This implies that S' has the form (7), where C is an arbitrary matrix of order $2n \times 2k$.

Finally we consider $L' = \bar{\varphi}(L)$. Let us assume the contrary, that is, there are $\lambda \in F$ and j_0, $j_1 \in \{1 \dots d\}$, $j_1 \neq j_2$, such that $\varrho_{ij_0}(L_1) = \lambda \varrho_{ij_1}(L_1)$ for any $x \in L_1$, $i \in \{1,2\}$. The matrix realization of L_1 has the following form:

$$\left\{\left(\begin{array}{cc|c} & & \\ \multicolumn{2}{c|}{0} & * \\ & & \\ \hline M_{11} & M_{21} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\ M_{1d} & M_{2d} & \end{array}\right)\right\}$$

where $M_{ij_0} = \lambda M_{ij_1}$ for any $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Using the formula (5), we obtain that L'_1 has the following form:

$$\left\{\left(\begin{array}{cc|c} & & \\ \multicolumn{2}{c|}{0} & * \\ & & \\ \hline M'_{11} & M'_{21} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\ M'_{1d} & M'_{2d} & \end{array}\right)\right\}$$

where $M'_{ij} = M_{ij}Q^{-1}$. Hence $M'_{ij_0} = \lambda M'_{ij_1}$ for any $i \in \{1, 2\}$. On the other hand, $S' = K' + L'$ and $\pi(S') = \pi(K') + \pi(L')$. Since the first columns of matrices from $\pi(S')$ are arbitrary vectors from F^{2n} and the first columns of matrices from $\pi(K')$ are zero, it follows that the first columns of matrices from $\pi(L')$ are arbitrary vectors from F^{2n}. This contradicts the fact that $M'_{1j_0} = \lambda M'_{1j_1}$. □

Lemma 1.1.8 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(2k, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(2k - 1, 2n)$, $L \cong sl(k, l)$. Then L_0-module W_{j_0}, $j_0 \in \{1 \dots d\}$ is neither of the type 1 no type 2.*

Proof.

We fix a basis in $V \oplus W$ of elements of subspaces V_i, $i = 1, 2$ and W_j,

$j = 1 \dots d$. In this basis L_0 takes a form

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{cc|ccc} Y & 0 & & & \\ 0 & -Y^t & & & \\ \hline & & Z_1 & & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & 0 & & Z_d \end{array} \right) \right\} \tag{8}$$

where Z_j is a matrix realization of L_0-module W_j

Let us assume the contrary, L_0-module W_{j_0} is either of the type 1 or type 2 for some j_0. Hence I_2 acts trivially on W_{j_0}. By Corollary 2.6, I_2 acts trivially on V. Therefore I_2 has the form (8) where $Z_{j_0} = 0$, $Y = 0$. Let L_1 have the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} & & * \\ 0 & & \\ \hline M_{11} & M_{21} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\ M_{1d} & M_{2d} & \end{array} \right) \right\}.$$

Then $[I_2, L_1]$ has the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} & & * \\ 0 & & \\ \hline M'_{11} & M'_{21} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\ M'_{1d} & M'_{2d} & \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

where M'_{ij_0}, $i \in \{1, 2\}$ are zero since $M'_{ij_0} = Z_{j_0} M_{ij_0} - M_{ij_0} 0 = 0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.1(d), $[I_2, L_1] = L_1$. By Lemma 2.7, it contradict the fact that, there exists $i_0 \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $M_{i_0 j_0}$ is not zero. □

In this paper we will employ the following construction. Let L-module $V(\lambda)$

and L'-module $V(\mu)$ are two irreducible modules. Then one can define $L \oplus L'$-module $V(\lambda) \otimes V(\mu)$ in the natural way

$$(X, Y)(v \otimes w) = X(v) \otimes w + v \otimes Y(w). \tag{9}$$

The following theorem (see [2]) holds:

Lemma 1.1.9 *If L-module $V(\lambda)$ and L'-module $V(\mu)$ are two irreducible modules then $L \oplus L'$-module $V(\lambda) \otimes V(\mu)$ is also irreducible with a highest weight (λ, μ).*

Lemma 1.1.10 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(2k, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(2k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong sl(k, l)$. If L_0-module W_{j_0}, $j_0 \in \{1 \dots d\}$ is of the type 3 then I_2-module W_{j_0} is either standard or dual.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.7(a), there exists i_0 such that $\pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1) \neq 0$. We consider L_0-module $V_{i_0}^* \otimes W_{j_0}$. Since I_1-module V_{i_0} and I_2-module W_{j_0} are irreducible, by Lemma 2.9, L_0-module $V_{i_0}^* \otimes W_{j_0}$ is also irreducible. Therefore L_0-module $\pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1)$ coincides with $V_{i_0} \otimes W_{j_0}^*$. By Lemma 2.1(b), L_0-module L_1 is a direct sum of two irreducible L_0-submodules of dimensions kl each. Since $\pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1)$ is irreducible L_0-module, it follows that dimension of $\pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1)$ is equal to kl because. On the other hand, we have

$$(\dim V_{i_0})(\dim W_{j_0}) = \dim (V_{i_0}^* \otimes W_{j_0}) = \dim \pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1) = kl.$$

Since V_{i_0} is a nontrivial $sl(k)$-module and W_{j_0} is a nontrivial $sl(l)$-module it follows that $\dim V_{i_0} \geq k$ and $\dim W_{j_0} \geq l$. Therefore $\dim V_{i_0} = k$ and $\dim W_{j_0} = l$. Hence W_{j_0} is either standard or dual. □

In the following Lemma $L_0 = I_1 \oplus I_2$ where I_1, I_2 are ideals of L_0.

Lemma 1.1.11 *Let U be an irreducible L_0-module such that $I_1(U) \neq 0$ and $I_2(U) \neq 0$. Then there exist U', $U'' \subseteq U$ such that U' is an irreducible I_1-module and U'' is an irreducible I_2-module. Moreover, U isomorphic to $U' \otimes U''$ as L_0-module.*

Proof.

Let $\lambda = (\lambda', \lambda'')$ be the highest weight of L_0-module U where λ' and λ'' correspond to I_1 and I_2. Next we can take I_1-module U_1 and I_2-module U_2 with the highest weights λ' and λ'', respectively. We define $I_1 \oplus I_2$-module $U_1 \otimes U_2$ as was shown above (see (9)). By Lemma 2.9, $I_1 \oplus I_2$-module $U_1 \otimes U_2$ is irreducible with the highest weight $(\lambda', \lambda'') = \lambda$. Therefore $I_1 \oplus I_2$-modules $U_1 \otimes U_2$ and U are isomorphic. Let ψ be a isomorphism between $U_1 \otimes U_2$ and U. Next we choose $u_1 \in U_1$ and $u_2 \in U_2$. By formula (9), $U_1 \otimes u_2$ is I_1-module and $u_1 \otimes U_2$ is I_2-module. Moreover, $U_1 \otimes u_2$ isomorphic to U_1 as I_1-module and $u_1 \otimes U_2$ isomorphic to U_2 as I_2-module. We define $U' = \psi(U_1 \otimes u_2)$ and $U'' = \psi(u_1 \otimes U_2)$. Since $U_1 \cong U'$ as I_1-module and $U_2 \cong U''$ as I_2-module, it follows that $U_1 \otimes U_2 \cong U' \otimes U''$ as $I_1 \oplus I_2$-module. Therefore U isomorphic to $U' \otimes U''$ as L_0-module. □

Lemma 1.1.12 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(2k, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(2k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong sl(k, l)$. Then for any $j_0 \in \{1 \dots d\}$, L_0-module W_{j_0} is not of the type 4 .*

Proof.

Let us assume the contrary, that is, there exist j_0 such that L_0-module W_{j_0} is of the type 4. By Lemma 2.11, there exist subspaces $W'_{j_0} \subseteq W_{j_0}$ and $W''_{j_0} \subseteq W_{j_0}$ such that W'_{j_0} is irreducible I_1-module, W''_{j_0} is irreducible I_2-module and $W_{j_0} \cong W'_{j_0} \otimes W''_{j_0}$ as $I_1 \oplus I_2$-modules.

First we show that $\dim W'_{j_0} = k$ and $\dim W''_{j_0} = l$. Since W'_{j_0} is an irreducible $sl(k)$-module and W''_{i_0} is an irreducible $sl(l)$-module, it follows that $\dim W'_{j_0} \geq k$ and $\dim W''_{j_0} \geq l$, respectively. Without any loss of generality, we assume that $\dim W'_{j_0} > k$. Therefore $2n = \dim W \geq \dim W_{j_0} = \dim W'_{j_0} \dim W''_{j_0} > kl$. Since $\dim S_1 \leq \dim K_1 + \dim L_1$, it follows that $\dim L_1 \geq \dim S_1 - \dim K_1 = 2(2k)(2n) - 2(2k-1)(2n) = 4n$. On the other hand, $\dim L_1 = 2kl$. Hence $2kl \geq 4n$. This contradicts the fact that $2n > kl$. Therefore $\dim W'_{j_0} = k$, $\dim W''_{j_0} = l$ and $W = W_{j_0}$. If we denote W'_{j_0} and W''_{j_0} as W' and W'', then $W \cong W' \otimes W''$.

Let us fix the following basis for W: $\{e'_i \otimes e''_j\}$, where $\{e'_i\}$ is a basis of

W' and $\{e''_j\}$ is a basis of W''. If we consider W as I_1-module then it can be expressed as the direct sum of I_1-modules $W' \otimes e''_k$:

$$W = (W' \otimes e''_1) \oplus \ldots \oplus (W' \otimes e''_k). \tag{10}$$

Let us prove that the projection π of L_1 onto $V^* \otimes W$ is not zero. Indeed, if $\pi(L_1) = \{0\}$ then L_1 has the following matrix form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & * \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \right\}.$$

Hence $[L_1, L_1] = \{0\}$. This contradicts the fact that, by Lemma 2.1(c), $[L_1, L_1] = L_0 \neq \{0\}$. Hence $\pi(L_1) \neq \{0\}$. Therefore there exists $i_0 \in \{1, 2\}$ such that the projection of L_1 onto $V^*_{i_0} \otimes W$ is not zero. Let us consider $V^*_{i_0} \otimes W$ as I_1-module. From (10) we obtain that

$$V^*_{i_0} \otimes W = (V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_1)) \oplus \ldots \oplus (V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_m))$$

where $V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_k)$ are also I_1-modules. The projection of L_1 onto $V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_k)$ is not zero for some k_0 since the projection of L_1 onto $V^*_{i_0} \otimes W$ is not zero.

We consider I_1-module $V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_{k_0})$. By Corollary 2.6, I_1-module V_{i_0} is either standard or dual. Since $\dim W' = k$, it follows that I_1-module W' is also either standard or dual. Next we apply Young tableaux technique (see [3]) to find irreducible submodules of I_1-module $(V^*_{i_0} \otimes W') \otimes e''_{k_0}$.

Let ϱ be either a standard or duel representation and ϱ' be also either a standard or duel representation of $sl(k)$. Then the tensor product $\varrho \otimes \varrho'$ is also a representation of $sl(k)$ and, by Young tableaux technique, it can only contain irreducible subrepresentations with highest weights $(2, 0, \ldots, 0)$, $(0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$, $(1, 0, \ldots, 0, 1)$ or a trivial representation.

Since I_1-modules V_{i_0} and W' are either standard or dual, we obtain that I_1-module $(V^*_{i_0} \otimes W') \otimes e''_{k_0}$ can only contain irreducible submodules with highest weights listed above. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.1(e) I_1-module L_1 has only standard irreducible submodules of dimension k. Contradiction.

□

Lemma 1.1.13 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(2k, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(2k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong sl(k, l)$. Then for any pairwise different $j_1, j_2 \in \{1 \dots d\}$, L_0-module W_{j_1} is not isomorphic to L_0-module W_{j_2}.*

Proof.

Let us assume the contrary, that is, L_0-modules W_{j_1} and W_{j_2} are isomorphic.

By Lemmas 2.8 and 2.12, any L_0-module W_{j_1} is of the type 3. Moreover, by Lemma 2.10, L_0-module W_{j_1} is either standard or dual.

Without any loss of generality, we only consider the case than L_0-module W_{j_1} is standard. Hence L_0-module W_{j_2} is also standard. By Corollary 2.6, L_0-module V_1 is standard and L_0-module V_2 is dual. Therefore we obtain two cases:

1. L_0-modules $V_1^* \otimes W_{j_1}$ and $V_1^* \otimes W_{j_2}$ have the same highest weight (μ, λ), where $\mu = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$ and $\lambda = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$

2. L_0-modules $V_2^* \otimes W_{j_1}$ and $V_2^* \otimes W_{j_2}$ have the same highest weight (λ, λ), where $\lambda = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$

By Lemma 2.1(b), L_0-module L_1 is a direct product of two irreducible submodules with highest weights (μ, λ) and (λ, μ) respectively. Hence the projections of L_1 onto $V_2^* \otimes W_{j_1}$ and $V_2^* \otimes W_{j_2}$ are zero since L_0-module L_1 contains no submodules with the highest weights (λ, λ).

Next, L_0-module $V_1^* \otimes W_{j_1}$ and L_0-module $V_1^* \otimes W_{j_2}$ are irreducible and have the same highest weights. Hence they are isomorphic as L_0-modules. Therefore $\varrho_{ij_1}(V^* \otimes W)$ and $\varrho_{ij_2}(V^* \otimes W)$ are also isomorphic as L_0-modules. By Schur's Lemma the only endomorphisms between these L_0-modules are scalars. However this contradicts to Lemma 2.7(b). □

Theorem 1.1.14 *Let $S = osp(m, 2n)$ be decomposed into the sum of two proper simple subalgebras K and L of the type $osp(p, 2q)$ and $sl(s, l)$, respectively. Then m is even, $m = 2k$ and $K \cong osp(2k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong sl(k, n)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.5, $m = 2k$ and $K \cong osp(2k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong sl(k, l)$. We only have to prove that $l = n$. Let us consider L_0-modules $W = W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_d$. By

Lemmas 2.8 and 2.12, for any $j \in \{1 \dots d\}$ L_0-module W_j is not of the type 1, 2 and 4. Hence any L_0-module W_j is of the type 3. Moreover, by Lemma 2.10, I_2-module W_j has dimension l. Since $\pi_2(I_2) \neq 0$, $\pi_2(I_2) \subseteq sp(2n)$ and $I_2 \cong sl(l)$, it follows that $l < 2n$. Hence $\dim W_j = l < 2n = \dim W$. Therefore W contains at least two L_0-modules W_1 and W_2 of type 3.

Next we show that $d = 2$. Let us assume the contrary. There exists L_0-modules W_3. Since L_0-modules W_3 is of the type 3, it follows that L_0-module W_3 is either standard or dual. By Lemma 2.13, L_0-modules W_1 and W_2 are not isomorphic. Therefore L_0-module W_3 is isomorphic to either L_0-modules W_1 or L_0-modules W_2. However, this contradicts Lemma 2.13. Since $d = 2$ it follows that $l = \dim W_1 = \dim W/2 = n$. Therefore $L \cong sl(k, n)$. □

Example 1 *We consider Lie superalgebra $S \cong osp(2k, 2n)$ in the standard matrix realization:*

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & B \\ \hline C & D \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

where $A \in gl(2k)$ and $D \in gl(2n)$ and $A^t = -A$, $D^t G = -GD$, $C = GB^t$, G is given by

$$G = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & I_n \\ \hline -I_n & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

Let the first subalgebra $K \cong osp(2k-1, 2n)$ have the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & & & \\ 0 & & X & \\ 0 & & & \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

where X is any $(2k + 2n - 1) \times (2k + 2n - 1)$ orthosymplectic matrices.

The second subalgebra $L \cong sl(k, n)$ consists of all matrices of the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} E & -F & P & Q^t \\ F & E & iP & -iQ^t \\ \hline Q & -iQ & D & 0 \\ -P^t & -iP^t & 0 & -D^t \end{array} \right) \right\} \tag{11}$$

where E is a skewsymmetric matrix of order k, F is a symmetric matrix of order k, P is a matrix of order $k \times n$, Q is a matrix of order $n \times k$ and D is a matrix of order n with zero trace.

Then $S = K + L$ is a decomposition of a simple Lie superalgebra onto the sum of two simple subalgebras.

Proof.

First we prove that the set of matrices (11) forms $sl(k,n)$. The standard matrix realization of $sl(k,n)$ has the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} X & P \\ \hline Q & Y \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

where X is a matrix of order k with zero trace, P is a matrix of order $k \times n$, Q is a matrix of order $n \times k$, Y is a matrix of order n with zero trace. Then $sl(k,n)$ also has the following matrix realization:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -X^t & Q^t \\ \hline -P^t & -Y^t \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

Therefore we consider $L' \cong sl(k,n)$ in the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} X & 0 & P & 0 \\ 0 & -X^t & 0 & Q^t \\ \hline Q & 0 & Y & 0 \\ 0 & -P^t & 0 & -Y^t \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

Let $\bar{\varphi}$ be an automorphism of $gl(2k,2n)$ of the form (5). The direct calculation gives us that $\bar{\varphi}(L')$ has the form (11) where $E = A - A^t$, $F = i(A + A^t)$. Therefore the set of matrices of the form (11) forms $sl(k,n)$.

Next we prove that the sum of two vector spaces K and L coincides with S.

Let

$$B = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ \hline B_{21} & B_{22} \end{array} \right).$$

Then

$$C = GB^t = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} B_{12}^t & B_{22}^t \\ \hline -B_{11}^t & -B_{21}^t \end{array} \right)$$

We set $B_{11} = P$ and $B_{12} = Q^t$. Then $B_{12}^t = Q$ and $-B_{11}^t = -P^t$. Since P and Q are arbitrary matrices of order $k \times n$ and $n \times k$, respectively, it follows that the first raw and column of matrices from L coincides with the first raw and column of matrices from S. □

1.1.5 Decompositions of $osp(2k, 2n)$ as the sum of $sl(p, q)$ and $sl(s, l)$

In this section we consider the decomposition of $osp(m, 2n)$ into the sum of two proper simple subalgebras $K \cong sl(p, q)$ and $L \cong sl(s, l)$.

Theorem 1.1.15 *A Lie superalgebra $S \cong osp(m, 2n)$ cannot be decomposed into the sum of two proper simple subalgebras K and L of the type $sl(p, q)$ and $sl(s, l)$, respectively.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.2(a), $S_0 = o(m) \oplus sp(2n)$. We define two projections π_1 and π_2 of S_0 onto the ideals $o(m)$ and $sp(2n)$, $\pi_1 : S_0 \to o(m)$ and $\pi_2 : S_0 \to sp(2n)$. Since $K \cong sl(p, q)$ and $L \cong sl(s, l)$, it follows that $K_0 \cong sl(p) \oplus sl(q) \oplus U$ and $L_0 \cong sl(s) \oplus sl(l) \oplus U$. Since K_0 and L_0 are reductive subalgebras, the projections $\pi_1(K_0)$, $\pi_1(L_0)$, $\pi_2(K_0)$ and $\pi_2(L_0)$ are also reductive as homomorphic images of reductive algebras.

Since $S = K + L$, S_0 is decomposable into the sum of two subalgebras K_0 and L_0, $S_0 = K_0 + L_0$. Therefore, $\pi_1(S_0) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ and $\pi_2(S_0) = \pi_2(K_0) + \pi_2(L_0)$, where $\pi_1(\mathcal{S}_0) = o(m)$ and $\pi_2(\mathcal{S}_0) = sp(2n)$. We have the decompositions of simple Lie algebras $o(m)$ and $sp(2n)$ into the sum of two reductive subalgebras.

By Onichshik's Theorem, $sp(2n)$ and $o(m)$ cannot be decomposed into the sum of two subalgebras of this form. Therefore $S \cong osp(m, 2n)$ cannot be decomposed into the sum of $K \cong sl(p, q)$ and $L \cong sl(s, l)$ □

1.1.6 Properties of subalgebras $osp(p, 2q)$ and $osp(s, 2l)$ in the decomposition

We consider the decomposition of $osp(m, 2n)$ into the sum of two proper simple subalgebras $K \cong osp(p, 2q)$ and $L \cong osp(s, 2l)$.

Lemma 1.1.16 *Let S be a Lie superalgebra of the type $osp(m, 2n)$, and S be decomposed into the sum of two proper simple subalgebras K and L of the type $osp(p, 2q)$ and $osp(s, 2l)$, respectively. Then two cases are possible:*

1. *$m = 4k$ and $K \cong osp(4k - 1, 2n)$, $L \cong osp(s, 2k)$*
2. *$K \cong osp(p, 2n)$, $L \cong osp(m, 2l)$ or $K \cong osp(m, 2q)$, $L \cong osp(s, 2n)$*

Proof.

By Lemma 2.2(a), $S_0 = o(m) \oplus sp(2n)$. We define two projections π_1 and π_2 of S_0 onto the ideals $o(m)$ and $sp(2n)$ as follows $\pi_1 : S_0 \to o(m)$ and $\pi_2 : S_0 \to sp(2n)$. Since $K \cong osp(p, 2q)$ and $L \cong osp(k, 2l)$, it follows that $K_0 \cong o(p) \oplus sp(2q)$ and $L_0 \cong o(k) \oplus sp(2l)$. Both K_0 and L_0 are semisimple. Hence $\pi_1(K_0)$, $\pi_1(L_0)$, $\pi_2(K_0)$ and $\pi_2(L_0)$ are also semisimple as homomorphic images of semisimple algebras.

Since $S = K + L$, S_0 is decomposable into the sum of two subalgebras K_0 and L_0, $S_0 = K_0 + L_0$. Therefore, $\pi_1(S_0) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ and $\pi_2(S_0) = \pi_2(K_0) + \pi_2(L_0)$. Moreover, $\pi_1(\mathcal{S}_0) = o(m)$ and $\pi_2(\mathcal{S}_0) = sp(2n)$. Now we have the decompositions of simple Lie algebras $o(m)$ and $sp(2n)$ into the sum of two semisimple subalgebras.

By Onichshik's Theorem, $sp(2n)$ has no decompositions into the sum of two proper reductive subalgebras of these types. Hence $sp(2n) = \pi_2(K_0) + \pi_2(L_0)$ is a trivial decomposition and either $\pi_2(K_0) = sp(2n)$ or $\pi_2(L_0) = sp(2n)$. Without any loss of generality, we assume that $\pi_2(K_0) = sp(2n)$. Hence $q = n$.

By Onichshik's Theorem, $o(m)$ has two decompositions into the sum of two proper reductive subalgebras:

1. If $m = 2k$ then $o(2k) = o(2k - 1) + sl(k)$,
2. If $m = 4k$ then $o(4k) = o(4k - 1) + sp(2k)$.

The decomposition $o(m) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ cannot be of the first type, because $\pi_1(K_0)$ and $\pi_1(L_0)$ are not isomorphic to $sl(k)$.

Next the two cases occur:

1. The decomposition $o(m) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ has the second form.
2. The decomposition $o(m) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ is trivial.

In the first case either $\pi_1(K_0) \cong o(4k-1)$ or $\pi_1(K_0) \cong sp(2k)$. Let $\pi_1(K_0) \cong sp(2k)$. We have that $\pi_2(K_0) = sp(2n)$. Hence $K_0 \cong sp(2k) \oplus sp(2n)$ or $K_0 \cong sp(2n)$. This contradicts the fact that $K_0 \cong o(p) \oplus sp(2q)$. Therefore $\pi_1(K_0) \cong o(4k-1)$ and $\pi_1(L_0) \cong sp(2k)$. Since $K_0 \cong o(p) \oplus sp(2q)$ and $L_0 \cong o(s) \oplus sp(2l)$ it follows that $p = 4k-1$ and $l = k$.

In the second case either $\pi_1(K_0) = o(m)$ or $\pi_1(L_0) = o(m)$. Let $\pi_1(K_0) = o(m)$. Since $\pi_2(K_0) = sp(2n)$ it follows that K_0 coincides with S_0. This contradicts the fact that K is proper subalgebra of S. Therefore $\pi_1(L_0) = o(m)$. Since $L_0 \cong o(s) \oplus sp(2l)$ it follows that $s = m$. □

Corollary 1.1.17 *Let $S = K + L$ and $K \cong osp(4k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong osp(s, 2k)$. Then L_0-module V is a direct sum of two L_0-modules of type 2, $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$. Moreover I_2 acts trivially on V, and I_1-modules V_1, V_2 are standard.*

Proof. From the previous Lemma we know that in the decomposition $o(4k) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ the first component isomorphic to $o(4k-1)$ and the second one isomorphic to $sp(2k)$. By Lemma 2.4, there exists a basis of V such that the decomposition $o(4k) = o(4k-1) + sp(2k)$ takes the matrix form (4). Hence $\pi_1(L_0)$ takes the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} Y & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -Y^t \end{array} \right) \right\}.$$

where $Y \in sp(2k)$.

Since I_2 acts trivially on V, we obtain that $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ and L_0-modules V_1, V_2 are of type 2 □

Corollary 1.1.18 *Let $S = K + L$ and $K \cong osp(p, 2n)$, $L \cong osp(m, 2l)$. Then*

L_0-module V is irreducible of type 2. Moreover I_2 acts trivially on V, and I_1-modules V is standard.

Proof. The proof follows from the fact that $\pi_1(L_0)$ coincides with $\pi_1(S_0)$.

1.1.7 Decompositions of $osp(4k,2n)$ as the sum of $osp(4k-1,2q)$ and $osp(s,2k)$

In this section we consider the case when $m = 4k$ and $K \cong osp(4k-1,2q)$, $L \cong osp(s,2k)$. Let $L_0 = I_1 \oplus I_2$ where $I_1 \cong sp(2k)$ and $I_2 \cong o(s)$.

Lemma 1.1.19 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(4k,2n)$, $K \cong osp(4k-1,2n)$, $L \cong osp(s,2k)$.*

(a) There is no $j_0 \in \{1 \dots d\}$ such that for any $i \in \{1,2\}$, $\pi_{ij_0}(L_1) = 0$.

(b) There are no $j_0, j_1 \in \{1 \dots d\}$ such that for some $\lambda \in F$, $\varrho_{ij_0}(x) = \lambda\varrho_{ij_1}(x)$ where $x \in L_1$, $i \in \{1,2\}$.

Proof.

Let us assume the contrary, that is, there exist j_0, $j_1 \in \{1 \dots d\}$ such that for any $i \in \{1 \dots r\}$ and $\lambda \in$ F, $\pi_{ij_0}(L_1) = \lambda\pi_{ij_1}(L_1)$.

We choose a basis in $V \oplus W$ from elements of subspaces V_i, $i = 1 \dots r$ and W_j, $j = 1 \dots d$. Let us identify the elements form S with their matrix realizations in this basis.

By Lemma 2.4, the $\pi_1(S_0) = \pi_1(K_0) + \pi_1(L_0)$ can be considered in the matrix form (4). Let $\bar{\varphi}$ be the automorphism of $gl(4k,2n)$ defined in Lemma 2.7. Then we obtain a new decomposition $\bar{\varphi}(S) = \bar{\varphi}(K) + \bar{\varphi}(L)$. Let $S' = \bar{\varphi}(S)$, $K' = \bar{\varphi}(K)$ and $L' = \bar{\varphi}(L)$.

Acting in the same matter as in Lemma 2.7 we obtain that L'_1 has the following form:

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc|c} & & \\ \multicolumn{2}{c|}{0} & * \\ & & \\ \hline M'_{11} & M'_{21} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\ M'_{1d} & M'_{2d} & \end{array}\right),$$

where $M'_{ij_0} = \lambda M'_{ij_1}$ for any $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Since $S' = K' + L'$, it follows that $\pi(S') = \pi(K') + \pi(L')$. As shown in Lemma 2.7, the first columns of matrices from $\pi(S')$ are arbitrary vectors from F^{2n}, and the first columns of matrices from $\pi(K')$ are zero. Hence the first columns of matrices from $\pi(L')$ are arbitrary vectors from F^{2n}. This contradicts the fact that $M'_{1j_0} = \lambda M'_{1j_1}$ □

Lemma 1.1.20 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(4k, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(4k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong osp(s, 2k)$. Then for any $j_0 \in \{1 \dots d\}$, L_0-module W_{j_0} is neither of the type 1 nor type 2.*

Proof.

We choose a basis in $V \oplus W$ from elements of subspaces V_i, $i = 1, 2$ and W_j, $j = 1 \dots d$. In this basis L_0 takes the form

$$\left\{\left(\begin{array}{cc|ccc} Y & 0 & & & \\ 0 & -Y^t & & & \\ \hline & & Z_1 & & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & 0 & & Z_d \end{array}\right)\right\}, \tag{12}$$

where Z_j is a matrix realization of L_0-module W_j

Let us assume the contrary, L_0-module W_{j_0} is either of the type 1 or type 2. Hence I_2 acts trivially on W_{j_0}. By Corollary 2.17, I_2 acts trivially on V.

Therefore I_2 has the form (12) where $Z_{j_0}=0$, $Y=0$. Let L_1 have the form:

$$\left\{\left(\begin{array}{cc|c} & & * \\ 0 & & \\ \hline M_{11} & M_{21} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\ M_{1d} & M_{2d} & \end{array}\right)\right\},$$

Then $[I_2, L_1]$ has the form:

$$\left\{\left(\begin{array}{cc|c} & & * \\ 0 & & \\ \hline M'_{11} & M'_{21} & \\ \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\ M'_{1d} & M'_{2d} & \end{array}\right)\right\},$$

where M'_{ij_0}, $i\in\{1,2\}$ is zero since $M'_{ij_0}=Z_{j_0}M_{ij_0}-M_{ij_0}0=0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2(d), $[I_2,L_1]=L_1$. This contradicts the fact that, by Lemma 2.19(a), there exists $i_0\in\{1,2\}$ such that $M_{i_0j_0}$ is not zero. □

Lemma 1.1.21 *Let $S=K+L$ where $S\cong osp(4k,2n)$, $K\cong osp(4k-1,2n)$, $L\cong osp(s,2k)$. Then for any $j\in\{1\dots d\}$, L_0-module W_{j_0} is not of the type 4.*

Proof.

Let us assume the contrary, that is, there exist j_0 such that L_0-module W_{j_0} is of the type 4. By Lemma 2.11, there exist subspaces $W'_{j_0}\subseteq W_{j_0}$ and $W''_{j_0}\subseteq W_{j_0}$ such that W'_{j_0} is irreducible I_1-module, W''_{j_0} is irreducible I_2-module and $W_{j_0}\cong W'_{j_0}\otimes W''_{j_0}$.

First we show that $\dim W'_{j_0}=2k$ and $\dim W''_{j_0}=s$. Since W'_{j_0} is an irreducible $sp(2k)$-module and W''_{i_0} is an irreducible $o(s)$-module, it follows that $\dim W'_{j_0}\geq 2k$ and $\dim W''_{j_0}\geq s$, respectively. Without any loss of generality, we assume that $\dim W'_{j_0}>2k$. Hence $2n=\dim W\geq \dim W_{j_0}=$

$\dim W'_{j_0} \dim W''_{j_0} > 2ks$. Since $\dim S_1 \leq \dim K_1 + \dim L_1$, it follows that $\dim L_1 \geq \dim S_1 - \dim K_1 \geq 2nm - 2n(m-1) = 2n > 2ks$. This contradicts the fact that $\dim L_1 = 2ks$ since $L \cong osp(s, 2k)$. Therefore $\dim W'_{j_0} = 2k$, $\dim W''_{j_0} = s$ and $W = W_{j_0}$. If we denote W'_{j_0} and W''_{j_0} as W' and W'', then $W \cong W' \otimes W''$.

Next we identify W with $W' \otimes W''$. Let us fix the following basis for W: $\{e'_i \otimes e''_j\}$, where $\{e'_i\}$ is a basis of W' and $\{e''_j\}$ is a basis of W''. If we consider W as I_1-module then it can be expressed as the direct sum of I_1-modules $W' \otimes e''_k$:

$$W = (W' \otimes e''_1) \oplus \ldots \oplus (W' \otimes e''_k). \tag{13}$$

Clearly the projection of L_1 onto $V^* \otimes W$ is not zero. Therefore there exists $i_0 \in \{1, 2\}$ such that the projection of L_1 onto $V^*_{i_0} \otimes W$ is not zero. Let us consider $V^*_{i_0} \otimes W$ as I_1-module. From (13) we obtain that

$$V^*_{i_0} \otimes W = (V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_1)) \oplus \ldots \oplus (V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_m))$$

where $V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_k)$ are also I_1-modules. The projection of L_1 onto $V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_k)$ is not zero for some k_0 since the projection of L_1 onto $V^*_{i_0} \otimes W$ is not zero.

We consider I_1-module $V^*_{i_0} \otimes (W' \otimes e''_{k_0})$. By Corollary 2.17, I_1-module V_{i_0} is standard. We have already proved that I_1-module W' is standard with highest weight $(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$. Next we apply generalized Young tableaux technique (see [3]) to find irreducible submodules of I_1-module $(V^*_{i_0} \otimes W') \otimes e''_{k_0}$.

If ϱ and ϱ' are standard representations of $sp(2k)$ $(o(k))$ with the same highest weight $(1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ then the tensor product $\varrho \otimes \varrho'$ is also a representation of $sp(2k)$ $(o(k))$. It can be decomposed into the direct sum of irreducible representations:

$$\varrho \otimes \varrho' = \varrho_1 \oplus \varrho_2 \oplus \varrho_3 \tag{14}$$

where ϱ_1 has highest weight $(2, 0, \ldots, 0)$, ϱ_2 has highest weight $(0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$ and ϱ_3 is a trivial representation.

Therefore I_1-module $(V^*_{i_0} \otimes W') \otimes e''_{k_0}$ contains only submodules with highest weights $(2, 0, \ldots, 0)$ and $(0, 1, 0, \ldots, 0)$. This contradicts the fact that, by

Lemma 2.2(e), I_1-module L_1 has only standard irreducible submodules of dimension $2k$. □

Lemma 1.1.22 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(4k, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(4k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong osp(s, 2k)$. If L_0-module W_{j_0}, $j_0 \in \{1 \dots d\}$ is of the type 3 then I_2-module W_{j_0} is standard.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.19, there exists i_0 such that $\pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1) \neq 0$. We consider L_0-module $V_{i_0}^* \otimes W_{j_0}$. By Lemma 2.9, since I_1-module V_{i_0} and I_2-module W_{j_0} are both irreducible, L_0-module $V_{i_0}^* \otimes W_{j_0}$ is irreducible. Therefore L_0-module $\pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1)$ coincides with $V_{i_0} \otimes W_{j_0}^*$ since $\pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1) \neq \{0\}$. By Lemma 2.2(b), L_0-module L_1 is irreducible, $\dim L_1 = 2ks$. Since $\pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1)$ is irreducible L_0-module, dimension of $\pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1)$ is $2ks$. On the other hand, we have

$$(\dim V_{i_0})(\dim W_{j_0}) = \dim (V_{i_0}^* \otimes W_{j_0}) = \dim \pi_{i_0 j_0}(L_1) = 2ks.$$

Since V_{i_0} is a nontrivial $sp(2k)$-module and W_{j_0} is a nontrivial $o(s)$-module, $\dim V_{i_0} \geq 2k$ and $\dim W_{j_0} \geq s$. Therefore $\dim V_{i_0} = 2k$ and $\dim W_{j_0} = s$. Hence I_2-module W_{j_0} is standard. □

Lemma 1.1.23 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(4k, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(4k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong osp(s, 2k)$. Then for any $j \in \{1 \dots d\}$, L_0-module W_j is not of the type 3.*

Proof.

We consider L_0-module $W_1 \oplus \dots \oplus W_d$. By Lemmas 2.20 and 2.21, L_0-module W_j is not of the type 1, 2 and 4. Hence any L_0-module W_j is of the type 3. By Lemma 2.22, L_0-module W_j has dimension s. Therefore $\dim W_j < \dim W$ since $s < 2n$. It follows that W contains at least two L_0-modules W_1 and W_2 of type 3.

By Corollary 2.17, V is a direct sum of two I_1-modules V_1 and V_2. We consider $I_1 \oplus I_2$-module $V_1^* \otimes W_1$. Without any loss of generality, $\pi_{11}(L_1) \neq 0$.

At first we prove that there exist $\lambda \in F$ such that $\varrho_{12}(x) = \lambda \varrho_{11}(x)$ for any $x \in L_1$ (see section 2.2). If $\pi_{12}(L_1) = \{0\}$ we choose $\lambda = 0$. Let $\pi_{12}(L_1) \neq 0$.

Since L_0-module L_1 is irreducible, L_0-module L_1 isomorphic to L_0-modules $\pi_{11}(L_1)$ and $\pi_{12}(L_1)$. Hence $\pi_{11}(L_1)$ and $\pi_{12}(L_1)$ are isomorphic as L_0-modules. Therefore $\varrho_{11}(L_1)$ and $\varrho_{12}(L_1)$ are also isomorphic as L_0-modules. By Schur's Lemma the only endomorphisms between these L_0-modules are scalars. Hence $\varrho_{12}(x) = \lambda\varrho_{11}(x)$ for any $x \in L_1$

Next we prove that $\varrho_{21}(L_1) = \{0\}$ and $\varrho_{22}(L_1) = \{0\}$.

Since I_1 acts trivially on W_1 and W_2, I_1 has the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

where

$$A = \left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} Y & 0 \\ \hline 0 & -Y^t \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

where Y is a set of matrices defined in Lemma 2.4.

Let $\langle A \rangle$ be associative enveloping algebra generated by all matrix from A. Since $\{Y\}$ is an irreducible set and $Y \neq -Y^t$ for some Y, it follows that $\langle A \rangle$ takes a matrix form

$$A = \left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} Y' & 0 \\ \hline 0 & Y'' \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

where Y', Y'' are arbitrary matrices of order $2k \times 2k$.

Hence $\langle A \rangle$ contains the following matrix

$$J = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} I & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

Since

$$\left[\left(\begin{array}{c|c} A & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & * \\ \hline C & 0 \end{array} \right) \right] = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & * \\ \hline -CA & 0 \end{array} \right),$$

we obtain that L_1 contains a set of matrices

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0 & * \\ \hline CJ & 0 \end{array} \right) \right\} \tag{15}$$

where

$$CJ = \begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ C_{s1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The subspace of L_1 of the form (15) has dimension $2ks$ since C_{11} can be any matrix of order $s \times 2k$. On the other hand, $\dim L_1 = 2ks$. Hence L_1 has the form (15).

Since $\pi_{21}(L_1) = \{0\}$ and $\pi_{22}(L_1) = \{0\}$, it follows that $\varrho_{21}(L_1) = \{0\}$ and $\varrho_{22}(L_1) = \{0\}$. Therefore $\varrho_{12}(x) = \lambda\varrho_{11}(x)$ and $\varrho_{22}(x) = \lambda\varrho_{21}(x)$ for any $x \in L_1$. This contradicts Lemma 2.19. □

Corollary 1.1.24 *A Lie superalgebra $S \cong osp(2k,2n)$ cannot be decomposed into the sum of two proper simple subalgebras K and L of the types $osp(4k-1,2q)$ and $osp(s,2k)$, respectively.*

Proof. The proof follows from the fact that for any $j \in \{1 \dots d\}$, L_0-module W_j is not of the type 1, 2, 3 and 4. □

1.1.8 Decompositions of $osp(m,2n)$ as the sum of $osp(p,2n)$ and $osp(m,2l)$

In this section we consider the case when $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(m,2n)$, $K \cong osp(p,2n)$ and $L \cong osp(m,2l)$. Let $L_0 = I_1 \oplus I_2$ where $I_1 \cong o(m)$ and $I_2 \cong sp(2l)$.

In the following Lemma we show that one of two subalgebras K and L, for example L, does not contain L_0-module W_j of the type 1 and 2.

Lemma 1.1.25 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(m,2n)$, $K \cong osp(p,2n)$ and $L \cong osp(m,2l)$. Then, without any loss of generality, L_0-module W_j, $j \in \{1 \dots d\}$ is neither of the type 1 nor 2.*

Proof.

We choose a basis in $V \oplus W$ from elements of subspaces V and W_j, $j = 1 \dots d$. In this basis L_0 takes the form

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} Y & & & \\ \hline & Z_1 & & 0 \\ & & \ddots & \\ & 0 & & Z_d \end{array} \right) \right\} \tag{16}$$

where Z_j is a matrix realization of L_0-module W_j

Let us assume the contrary, that is, there exists j_0 such that L_0-module W_{j_0} is either of the type 1 or 2. Without any loss of generality, let $j_0 = d$.

Hence I_2 acts trivially on W_d. By Corollary (2.18), I_2 acts trivially on V. Therefore I_2 has the form (16) where $Z_d = 0$, $Y = 0$. Let L_1 have the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} 0 & N_{11} & \dots & N_{1d} \\ \hline M_{11} & & & \\ \vdots & & 0 & \\ M_{1d} & & & \end{array} \right) \right\}. \tag{17}$$

Then $[I_2, L_1]$ also has the form (17), where M_{1d} and N_{1d} are zero since $Z_d M_{1d} - M_{1d} 0 = 0$ and $0 N_{1d} - N_{1d} Z_d = 0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2(d), $[I_2, L_1] = L_1$. Therefore M_{1d} and N_{1d} are zero and L consists of the matrices with the last row and column are zero.

Acting in the same manner as above, we obtain that $K \cong osp(p, 2n)$ consists of the matrices with the first row and column are zero. This contradicts the fact that $S = K + L$. □

Lemma 1.1.26 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(m, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(p, 2n)$ and $L \cong osp(m, 2l)$. Then for any $j \in \{1 \dots d\}$, L_0-module W_j is not of the type 4.*

Proof.

The proof of this Lemma is similar to the proof of Lemma 2.21.

Lemma 1.1.27 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(m, 2n)$, $K \cong osp(p, 2n)$ and $L \cong osp(m, 2l)$. If L_0-module W_{j_0}, $j_0 \in \{1 \dots d\}$ is of the type 3 then I_2-module W_{j_0} is standard.*

Proof.

Without any loss of generality, we only consider the case $j_0 = 1$.

First we show that $\pi_{11}(L_1) \neq \{0\}$. Let us assume the contrary, that is, $\pi_{11}(L_1) = \{0\}$. Then L_1 takes the form (17) where M_{11} is zero. Hence $[L_1, L_1]$ takes the form (16) where Z_1 is zero.

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2(b), $L_0 = [L_1, L_1]$. Hence L_0 also have the form (16) where Z_1 is zero. This contradicts the fact that L_0-module W_1 is of the type 3. Therefore $\pi_{11}(L_1) \neq \{0\}$.

Next we consider L_0-module $V_1^* \otimes W_1$. By Lemma 2.9, L_0-module $V_1^* \otimes W_1$ is irreducible since I_1-module V_1 and I_2-module W_1 are irreducible. Therefore L_0-module $\pi_{11}(L_1)$ coincides with $V_1 \otimes W_1^*$ since $\pi_{11}(L_1) \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.2(b), L_1 is an irreducible L_0-module of dimension $2ml$. Therefore dimension of $\pi_{11}(L_1)$ is equal to $2ml$ since $\pi_{11}(L_1)$ is irreducible L_0-module. On the other hand, we have

$$(\dim V_1)(\dim W_1) = \dim (V_1^* \otimes W_1) = \dim \pi_{11}(L_1) = 2ml.$$

Since V_1 is a nontrivial $sp(m)$-module and W_1 is a nontrivial $o(2l)$-module, it follows that $\dim V_1 \geq m$ and $\dim W_1 \geq 2l$. Therefore $\dim V_1 = m$ and $\dim W_1 = 2l$. Hence I_2-module W_{j_0} is standard. □

Lemma 1.1.28 *Let $S = K + L$ where $S \cong osp(m,2n)$, $K \cong osp(p,2n)$ and $L \cong osp(m,2l)$. Then for any $j \in \{1 \dots d\}$, L_0-module W_j is not of the type 3.*

Proof.

We consider L_0-modules $W_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus W_d$. By Lemmas 2.25 and 2.26, L_0-module W_j is not of the type 1, 2 and 4. Hence any L_0-module W_j is of the type 3. Moreover, by Lemma 2.27, L_0-module W_j has dimension $2l$. Since since $2l < 2n$, it follows that $\dim W_j < \dim W$. Therefore W contains at least two L_0-modules W_1 and W_2 of type 3. By Corollary 2.18, V is an irreducible I_1-module. We consider $I_1 \oplus I_2$-module $V_1^* \otimes W_1$.

At first we prove that there exist $\lambda \in F$ such that $\varrho_{12}(x) = \lambda\varrho_{11}(x)$ for any $x \in L_1$ (see section 2.2). If $\pi_{12}(L_1) = \{0\}$ we choose $\lambda = 0$. Let $\pi_{12}(L_1) \neq 0$. Since L_0-module L_1 is irreducible, L_0-module L_1 isomorphic to L_0-modules $\pi_{11}(L_1)$ and $\pi_{12}(L_1)$. Hence $\pi_{11}(L_1)$ and $\pi_{12}(L_1)$ are isomorphic as L_0-modules. Therefore $\varrho_{11}(L_1)$ and $\varrho_{12}(L_1)$ are also isomorphic as L_0-modules. By Schur's Lemma, $\varrho_{12}(x) = \lambda\varrho_{11}(x)$ for any $x \in L_1$

Hence the matrix realization of L_1 has the form

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|cccc} 0 & N_{11} & N_{12} & \dots & N_{1d} \\ \hline M_{11} & & & & \\ M_{12} & & & & \\ \vdots & & & 0 & \\ M_{1d} & & & & \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

where M_{1i} is a matrix of order $2l \times m$, N_{1j} is a matrix of order $m \times 2l$ and $M_{12} = \lambda M_{11}$.

The commutator of any two matrices from L_1 has the form:

$$\left\{ \left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} X & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \hline 0 & Z_{11} & \dots & Z_{1d} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & Z_{d1} & \dots & Z_{dd} \end{array} \right) \right\}$$

where $Z_{ij} = M_{ji}N'_{jj} - M'_{ji}N_{jj}$.

We know that L_0-modules W_1 and W_2 are of type 3. Hence there exist $Z_{11} \neq 0$ and $Z_{22} \neq 0$. Since $Z_{11} = M_{11}N'_{11} - M'_{11}N_{11}$ and $Z_{22} = M_{12}N'_{12} - M'_{12}N_{12}$, it follows that there exist $M_{11} \neq 0$ and $M_{12} \neq 0$. Therefore $\lambda \neq 0$. On the other hand, $Z_{21} = M_{12}N'_{11} - M'_{12}N_{11} = \lambda(M_{11}N'_{11} - M'_{11}N_{11}) = \lambda Z_{11}$. Hence $Z_{12} = \lambda Z_{11} \neq 0$. This contradicts the fact that L_0 has the form (16) where $Z_1 \neq 0$. □

Corollary 1.1.29 *A Lie superalgebra $S \cong osp(m, 2n)$ cannot be decomposed into the sum of two proper simple subalgebras K and L of the type $osp(p, 2n)$ and $osp(m, 2l)$, respectively.*

Proof. The proof follows from the fact that for any $j \in \{1 \dots d\}$, L_0-module W_j is not of the type 1, 2, 3 and 4. □

From Lemma 2.16 and Corollaries 2.24, 2.29, we obtain following theorem

Theorem 1.1.30 *A Lie superalgebra $S \cong osp(2k, 2n)$ cannot be decomposed into the sum of two proper simple subalgebras K and L of the type $osp(p, 2q)$ and $osp(s, 2l)$, respectively.*

From Theorems 2.14,2.15 and 2.30 we obtain following Theorem:

Theorem 1.1.31 *Let $S = osp(m, 2n)$ be a Lie superalgebra such that $S = K+L$ where K, L are two proper basic simple subalgebras. Then m is even, $m = 2k$ and $K \cong osp(2k-1, 2n)$, $L \cong sl(k, n)$.*

Bibliography

[1] **Bahturin Yu, Tvalavadze M, Tvalavadze T.** *Sums of Simple and Nilpotent Lie Subalgebras.*, Comm. in Algebra, vol. 30, 2002, 9, 4455-4471.

[2] **Goto M, Grosshans F.** *Semisimple Lie algebras.* Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 38. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York-Basel, 1978. vii+480 pp.

[3] **Frappat L, Sciarrino A.** *Dictionary on Lie algebras and Superalgebras.* In: Questions of group theory and homological algebra, London, 2000.

[4] **Kac V.G.** *Lie superalgebras.*, Adv. Math. **26**, 1977, no. 1, 8–96

[5] **Onishchik A.L.** *Decompositions of reductive Lie groups.,* Mat. Sbornik, **80(122)**, 1969, 4, 515-554.

[6] **Onishchik A.L.** *Topology of Transitive Transformation Groups.*, Johann Ambrosius Barth Verlag GmbH, Leipzig, 1994, xvi+300 pp.

[7] **Tvalavadze T.** *Simple decompositions of simple Lie superalgebras* $sl(m,n)$., to appear.